UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,714	10/07/2005	Michael H. May	PAT 838W-2	4459
	7590 01/15/201 ONER GERVAIS LLP	EXAMINER		
Anne Kinsman	LANCE DI AZA	ROGERS, JAMES WILLIAM		
WORLD EXCHANGE PLAZA 100 QUEEN STREET SUITE 1100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OTTAWA, ON	K1P 1J9	1618		
CANADA				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipinfo@blgcanada.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/552,714	MAY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAMES W. ROGERS	1618	

	JAMES W. ROGERS	1618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	•	36(a) and the appropriat	e extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount on the contract of the corresponding amount of the contract of the correct	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	liames with 27 CED 44 27 movet be 4	Slad wikhin two manth	
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
<ul> <li>(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b) ☒ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloge)</li> <li>(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.12)</li> <li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ul>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);  there form for appeal by materially redeserresponding number of finally rejected and 41.33(a)).  21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor  Towable if submitted in a separate, to will not be entered, or b) will	E below);  ducing or simplifying the cted claims.  mpliant Amendment (Intelligence of the complete of the comp	PTOL-324).
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 6-10 and 22. Claim(s) rejected: 1,4-5,12-15,17-21 and 23-26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11.  ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	no hoggues:
. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowari	de pecause.
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to applicants claims would necessitate a new search and/or consideration by the examiner because previously the limitations that the ancient defense polymer excludes cellulose and that the ancient defense polymer has selective antimicrobial activity which are now presented in amended claims 1, 20 and 24 were not presented before the examiner previously. Furthermore the new limitation may include new matter, the examiner could not find support for the new amendments nor have applicants led the examiner to where support for these new limitations may be found within the specification.